

CHOLLAS CREEK METALS TMDL IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

STAKEHOLDER MEETING SUMMARY

October 6, 20008
9:00-11:00 AM

City of San Diego, Storm Water Department Offices
9370 Chesapeake Dr., Suite 100
San Diego, CA 92123
Conference Room No. 1

1. Introductions

2. Purpose of Project/Schedule (Drew Kleis)

The group's overarching purpose is to develop a plan identifying activities that will improve water quality in Chollas Creek. To that end, the objective of the Implementation Plan is to implement water quality monitoring, identify BMP projects to improve water quality in Chollas Creek.

Goal for this meeting: To obtain stakeholder input on the Implementation Plan approach, schedule, monitoring strategy, and annotated outline.

The proposed 12 month schedule was presented for review and comment. The goal is to have a complete Implementation Plan, based on the Chollas TMDL, by September 2009. Comments from the group included:

- Consider each agency's budget approval process in the schedule
- Ensure all agencies in the TMDL are adequately recognized in the schedule

The deadline for comments on the monitoring strategy, annotated outline, and Implementation Plan schedule is Friday, October 17, 2008.

3. TMDL Background (Ruth Kolb/Dave Renfrew)

Stakeholders were provided an overview of Chollas Creek's historic water quality issues which include: diazinon and chlorpyrifos-toxicity, dissolved metals (in freshwater in the creek), total metals (in saltwater at mouth of Chollas), and bacteria. A TMDL exists for pesticides. The TMDL for dissolved metals is expected to be approved this fall, possibly in the next several weeks.

The RWQCB commented on the TMDL for bacteria. The State Board is expected to require the numeric targets to be modified. The TMDL will be resubmitted to the State Board at the beginning of 2009. The new TMDL is anticipated to be complete by late-Spring 2009). [Note: the Bacteria TMDL discussion is for information only].

4. TMDL Monitoring Strategy (Ruth Kolb)

Generally, stakeholders supported the proposed monitoring approach that includes: composite sampling of the two mass loading stations (SD-8 and DPR-2), additional composite sampling at the jurisdictional boundaries (LG-1 and LM-1), and collection of up to 16 grab samples.

Stakeholders approved the grab sampling approach but requested further detail on the purpose and location of these sampling locations. Ruth Kolb, City of San Diego, stated that the basis for the proposed locations will be presented in the Monitoring Plan. The purposes for these samples include 1) assessing existing water quality conditions in high priority sections and 2) assessing the effectiveness of implemented BMPs. Grab sampling will begin during the next fiscal year. All of the proposed sampling locations will undergo field investigation and review.

The proposed locations of the 16 grab sample sites resulted in extensive discussion between stakeholders. Comments from the group included:

- *Where is the location of LG-1 relative to the preserve?*
 - LG-1 is located at the Federal building at the bridge.
 - LG-1 is close to, but not directly on, the City of San Diego/Lemon Grove jurisdictional boundary. Flow travels approximately 600 feet through an enclosed pipe before discharging to an inaccessible portion of the natural channel of Chollas Creek. It is not possible to sample upstream of the bridge location because there are no easements to obtain access.
- *There was some concern that LG-1 might be impacted by contaminated groundwater.*
 - This ground water is believed to originate from Chollas Heights Reservoir (Chollas Lake) and flow through the landfill to LG-1.
 - The City of San Diego will further investigate this issue. It is not anticipated to be a problem because the landfill is at a higher elevation than the Reservoir.
- *A group member recommended conducting grab sampling monitoring at least 1 site, preferably 2 sites, below the mass loading stations in industrial area at the mouth of Chollas.*
 - The RWQCB indicated this area is a priority for additional monitoring.
- *Stakeholders also recommended conducting grab sample monitoring at:*
 - Auburn Creek
 - 51st Street Canyon (which could be used as a comparison to other areas)
 - Northwestern portions of the watershed
- *Stakeholders recommended including chlordane as an analyte (pesticides).*

5. Annotated Outline (David Pohl, Drew Kleis)

The annotated outline is based on the Chollas Creek TMDL, the City of San Diego's *Strategic Plan for Watershed Activity Implementation* [“Strategic Plan”], the *Chollas Creek TMDL Source Loading, Best Management Practices, and Monitoring Strategy Assessment* (<http://www.sandiego.gov/thinkblue/programreports/index.shtml>), water quality monitoring data, and information obtained from TMDL implementation programs in the L.A. region (http://63.199.216.6/larwqcb_new/bpa/tmdl_listW.php). As stated in the annotated outline, the agencies party to the TMDL will identify a suite of activities to implement in separate appendices. Following the iterative process outlined in the City of San Diego’s Strategic Plan, the responsible agencies’ lists of activities will identify specific projects in initial years to be implemented and assessed. As activity efficiencies are determined, the responsible agencies will identify specific projects in future years.

Comments were requested on the Annotated Outline by October 17, 2008.

6. Comments / New Business

Stakeholders recommended integrating the Implementation Plan and Plan components into annual Budget(s) and receive approval from Council(s). The budget should also be reflected in the project schedule.

Stakeholders recommended keeping the Planning Commission informed about the Implementation Plan and approach to BMP implementation.

Stakeholders suggested integrating the new numeric target evaluation process for the Bacteria TMDL into the Implementation Plan (maximum yearly exceedance days will replace the existing MPN/100ml method). Natural sources exclusion (with reference site criteria) will still apply. Changes to the Basin Plan and TMDL are expected to be completed in Spring 2009.

Stakeholders asked why the San Diego Unified School District was not included in the TMDL? Stakeholders discussed how to include Phase II Permits holders into the planning process and TMDL. Ben Tobler, RWQCB, suggested that the responsible agencies submit written communication to the RWQCB inquiring about the incorporation of Phase II agencies into the TMDL.

Stakeholders recommended possible Tier I or Tier II activities including:

- Ordinance changes to limit the use of items like material that present high pollutant loading potential to receiving waters (e.g. zinc fencing).
- Higher frequency of inspections for target commercial facilities and businesses.
- Additional BMPs for business types with a high potential to discharge metals.

Stakeholders recommended including a bibliography as an Appendix.

Stakeholders recommended that the schedule indicate the milestones for each Discharger. It was suggested that the Cities of Lemon Grove and La Mesa may be able to present plan to City Council in May, rather than March.

Stakeholders asked if any data/conclusions were available regarding the City of San Diego's aggressive street sweeping pilot project. The City of San Diego clarified that the street sweeping pilot study data is currently under assessment. The data may be discussed and presented at a later date/time, likely after January 2009. Information regarding the City's pilot project may be obtained here:

(<http://www.sandiego.gov/thinkblue/programs/spprojects/index.shtml>).

Stakeholders suggested creating visuals to clearly communicate the urgency of the Implementation Plan, such as a "clock" to count down to Implementation of TMDL.

Closing notes/next meeting: the next stakeholder meeting will be scheduled in December, and the responsible agencies will work to develop a draft Implementation Plan with draft project lists for review and discussion.

Stakeholders recommended streamlining the reporting processes under this and other TMDLs, such as potentially integrating TMDL reporting in the Chollas Creek watershed into one report that would be included as part of the Municipal Permit Copermittee's Watershed Urban Runoff Management Program (WURMP) annual reports.